1 have at the moment with regard 2 construction. All right. JUDGE SIPPEL: 3 you're jumping ahead of me a little bit, but 4 thank you for that response. I'm talking 5 about the organic documents on the corporate 6 structure, corporate direction, that type of 7 8 thing. 9 MS. KANE: We do have those documents, Your Honor, but as we referenced in 10 our motion to clarify, we do not believe that 11 12 those documents have any bearing on whether 13 their stations are operating and whether their 14 stations have been constructed. 15 JUDGE SIPPEL: Look, let me tell you where I'm coming from on this: 16 I don't 17 care whether it's a one-issue case. You got to know who the party is that you're suing. 18 I don't know who the party Maritime is until 19 I get this information. I don't care whether 20 21 it's one issue --

MS. KANE: We're happy to obtain

1	that discovery, Your Honor.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm glad
3	you're happy because that's what I'm trying to
4	get out. That's all I'm trying to do. I
5	mean, that's all I'm trying to do. And I'm
6	not getting resistance on it, but now I find
7	out that there's an enormous amount of
8	information that came in with the letter of
9	inquiry
LO	MS. KANE: Well
L1	JUDGE SIPPEL: that I never
L2	thought to ask about. But I'm not being
L3	critical of you. Please don't misunderstand
L4	me.
L5	MS. KANE: No, no, no. I
L6	understand, Your Honor. We have those
L7	documents and
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
L9	MS. KANE: we have never said
20	otherwise.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I know you
22	haven't.

1	MS. KANE: In terms of whether
2	Maritime has produced them in this case, they
3	have not produced them in this matter because,
4	in reference to discovery requests that would
5	have precipitated that information, we haven't
6	been proceeding with that discovery based on
7	your order in November. We're happy to
8	proceed down that path, but these documents
9	really don't provide anything more than
10	cursory information about who was named a
11	partner or who was named a managing member.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: You think that's
13	not too important? Who's running the show?
14	I mean
15	MS. KANE: Well, anybody
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: managing
17	partners are pretty important people.
18	MS. KANE: Well, understood, Your
19	Honor, but
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't know who
21	they are. That's my problem.
22	MS. KANE: Well, neither does the

1	Bureau, Your Honor, which is partly why we had
2	an HDO that was directed to the question of
3	who was running the show day-to-day.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, but that's
5	where the start is. The start is with the
6	organic documents. And then you get a person
7	on the you depose and then you go from
8	there. You can only work with what you have.
9	And this is the first time that I'm seeing
10	what I wanted to see up front. And again,
11	this is not a criticism.
12	Let me ask you this question,
13	please, everybody. You have any objection to
14	you furnishing me a copy of everything having
15	to do with the letter of inquiry or even
16	subsequent letter of inquiries?
17	MS. KANE: I don't think there
18	should be any concern with that, Your Honor.
19	We have the
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Keller?
21	MS. KANE: confidentiality
22	agreement, Your Honor.

1	MR. KELLER: Subject to the
2	confidentiality a protective order
3	MS. KANE: A protective order,
4	yes.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Well, when
6	you get a chance, why don't you package those
7	up and send them down to me?
8	MS. KANE: We can bring those to
9	you today, Your Honor.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: That will be fine.
11	That will be fine. And that's the end of my
12	inquiry on that.
13	So you said you have a shorter
14	list now of your first item, which is the
15	motion to compel Maritime to respond. You're
16	making some headway on that, if I understand
17	that right.
18	MS. KANE: I think we're making
19	some headway. To be honest, and I feel like
20	in some instances we're taking two steps
21	forward and one step back because the
22	information, at least as to operation, is

constantly changing for Maritime. When we compared, for example, the order that you issued on Monday to previous information that Maritime had either stipulated to oridentified in previous filings, the dates are off. There's four or five dates that are and now we're getting inconsistent, information in the pleading that they filed today.

But I think we're at least comfortable providing you with where we stand on the stations that are currently in play. There might be a few here and there that Mr. Keller is going to have an issue with because they're not in the right list, but that's based on the fact that we didn't get that information until this morning.

So we're happy to provide that to you, and we have copies for everybody. We're happy to set those out and explain to you what it is that we don't have with regard to certain stations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

7	TUDGE CIDDEL. Well that makes
1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that makes
2	sense, I mean, as far as an order of business.
3	Anybody have any objection to
4	that?
5	MR. KELLER: No, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, do have
7	copies to pass around?
8	MS. KANE: We do.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you very
10	much. And while you're doing that, by the
11	way, I failed to introduce a very important
12	part of my team up here, and that's Ms. Denise
13	Villarreal to my right and Ms. Emily Marshall
14	to my further right. And there's no political
15	connotation there at all, please. But Ms.
16	Villarreal is she's been declared the
17	office meisterin on the charts, and she's been
18	working quite assiduously on them and
19	unfortunately I'm going to lose her on Friday.
20	So there goes my knowledge. So we'll pick
21	this up right now.

MS. KANE:

We can walk you through

The first category are stations for this. which Maritime has not provided any current information about whether it is currently operating and offering any type of service, if it's not operating, why it isn't operating, and whether it was operating and offering service at the time it acquired these licenses in 2005. All we've gotten are sort of general statements that as of 2007 none of these licenses were offering any service, but we've got no information before 2007. And we've gotten nothing that confirms that any of these stations are currently operating, or if they haven't been currently operating, when they went off the air.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Can you respond to that briefly, sir?

MR. KELLER: Well, I can't respond specifically as to station by station, but what I can say is I can only reiterate what I said in the document that I filed this morning, and that is that I believe, with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

exception of stations that are being used in 1 conjunction with spectrum leases, where the 2 3 customer, if you will, is the spectrum lessee -- and I don't know which ones -- I mean, I 4 think several of the KAA89 things on here fall 5 under that category. 6 But with that exception, I think 7 8 what we have stated in interrogatory responses -- and I'll be happy to cobble together a sort 9 of consolidated response focused on these 10 items, you know, based on what we've already 11 12 said in other places --JUDGE SIPPEL: That would be very 13 14 helpful. 15 MR. KELLER: But basically, again, 16 I'll reiterate what we said. First of all, we stated that none of these stations -- again, 17 excluding the leased stations -- have been 18 19 providing service to customers since December of 2007. Okay. That's number one. 2.0 number two, we said that, 21 22 nevertheless, the company did not intend to

permanently discontinue, so they maintained -they did not dismantle the stations. They
left them in operational status. Not to say
they were operating and providing service, but
in operational status in the sense that the
stations were constructed, connected, able to
operate.

We then said it is currently -now the stations fall into three categories:
Those which we now know are not operational,
and for those we have given the dates when
they became non-operational and in under what
circumstances and why; stations which we know
to be or have reasonable belief they're still
operational; and some stations, which we quite
frankly just don't know because we haven't
been able to go out --

(Phone rings)

MR. KELLER: And so those are the categories. They're either operational, not operational; and where they're not operational, we've provided the date and the

reason, or we don't know. We do know that
they haven't been providing service since
2007, but we don't know whether they're still
operational. And we've spelled out which ones
those are. Now there might be a minor
discrepancy here or there, which I'll be happy
to look at and clarify.
Lastly, as to I have to go back
and look at
JUDGE SIPPEL: You have them
identified that way, by the way?
MR. KELLER: Pardon me?
JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you have each of
these stations identified that way, or each of
the call signs?
MR. KELLER: I believe so, but
apparently it hasn't been made I mean, and
I'll take responsibility, but apparently it's
not clear to the Bureau so that if I say I
will certainly cobble them together and
clarify, but yes.
JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KELLER: And that was what -I think in a good faith effort that's what we
were attempting to convey by these charts, the
status of each station. And the status are -first of all, as to all the stations we've
maintained and provided what documentation we
have, that they're -- they were timely
constructed. Okay? So now we're just talking
about whether or not the stations are in
operation.

And we've stated that -- first of all, I believe we stated in some interrogatory response somewhere that they were all in continuous operation up to that -- you know, unless other specifically specified somewhere, up to that December 2007 date. There were a couple where we've given dates earlier than that. I mean, for instance, a couple of towers that blew down in Katrina, or whatever.

But we basically said they're not in operation. No service as to then. We've stated which ones are not operational, we've

1	stated which ones are operational, and we've
2	stated which ones we don't know one way or the
3	other.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, that reminds
5	me of a historical figure who identified
6	combat conditions as the known, the unknown
7	and the unknowns that you don't know are the
8	unknowns. And it sounds like you've got the
9	same situation here. You've got
10	MR. KELLER: Well, I
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: quite a category
12	there.
13	MR. KELLER: We have known and
14	unknown actually in this case, and the knowns
15	fall into two categories: Those we know to be
16	operational and those we not to be
17	operational. And then there's the unknowns
18	where we don't know for sure whether they're
19	still operational.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Now I'm
21	going to ask you two questions: First of all,
22	you mentioned the date 2007, specific ones

1	that you know about became non-operational.
2	Can you tell me why that is?
3	MR. KELLER: No, no. 2007 was the
4	lack of no longer providing service to end
5	users.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's not the same
7	thing as operation?
8	MR. KELLER: Well, but that's the
9	point I'm trying to make. No, they're not.
10	I mean
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: What does
12	"operational" mean?
13	MR. KELLER: As I've said several
14	times, it means that the station was left
15	constructed, installed, capable of operation.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: But never turned
17	the switch on? I'm paraphrasing it.
18	MR. KELLER: No, well, the
19	switches may be on, but I mean, the point
20	it's running. It's running. It's just that
21	it doesn't have any customers on it.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's the point.

1	Now and then you just said something before
2	that seems to be inconsistent with what you
3	just said.
4	MR. KELLER: Your Honor, what I'm
5	doing is making a distinction between the
6	station being actively used to serve
7	customers
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
9	MR. KELLER: versus a station
10	that is not being actively used to who can
11	serve customers, but is nonetheless
12	operational
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
14	MR. KELLER: versus a station
15	that is no longer even operational. Those are
16	the three categories.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let's start
18	with the last one, the ones that are not
19	operational.
20	MR. KELLER: And on those we
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry, you can
22	identify those or you

1	MR. KELLER: We have identified
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now why are they in
3	that state of non-operation?
4	MR. KELLER: And that's what's
5	spelled out in the pleading that I filed this
6	morning and in the early interrogatory
7	responses.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you give me
9	just a quick
10	MR. KELLER: In some well
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just a
12	MR. KELLER: Yes.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just a general
14	explanation?
15	MR. KELLER: In most cases it's
16	because in these cases the non-operational
17	status occurred within the last year or two.
18	In most cases it's because of an inability to
19	pay utilities and finally the utilities were
20	cut off. And since the utilities are cut off,
21	the station is not operating. It can't

don't

have

they

because

operate

22

any

1	electricity.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, it's like if I
3	don't pay my electric bill, then I'm going to
4	be without electricity.
5	MR. KELLER: And then your house
6	is without lights. If they shut off your
7	electricity or shut off our telephone
8	connections, then the station's
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right.
10	MR. KELLER: not operational.
11	It may be sitting there, but it's not
12	operational.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now my question is,
14	well, why is that happening? The company
15	couldn't afford to pay the bills?
16	MR. KELLER: The company's been in
17	financial straits for some number of years and
18	recently it's gotten to the point
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, there's two
20	kinds of financial straits. I mean, there's
21	real financial straits and then there's the
22	question of paying the bills, you know, paying

1	for the lights and the water and all that kind
2	of stuff.
3	MR. KELLER: What happened is,
4	Your Honor, the company, even before it went
5	into bankruptcy, the company has had financial
6	difficulties maintaining expenses all along.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why did it
8	wait this long to go into bankruptcy?
9	MR. KELLER: They've been hoping
10	to cut deals. They made several deals to sell
11	the licenses, to do leases. I mean, let me
12	just give you a little bit of the history; and
13	I know
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
15	MR. KELLER: Ms. Kane doesn't
16	want to get into testimony here, but for
17	example, when these stations were purchased by
18	Maritime this
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: And the date?
20	MR. KELLER: financial
21	difficulty goes all the way back to
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is mostly

1	when? When's the dates that most of those
2	purchases were?
3	MR. KELLER: No, but they were all
4	Maritime acquired these licenses from
5	Mobex.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mobex?
7	MR. KELLER: I think it was late
8	I think it closed in early 2006 was the
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: What are you
10	showing there?
11	MS. VILLARREAL: They were
12	assigned in June of 2005 and February 2007.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Bought from Mobex
14	to you?
15	MS. VILLARREAL: From Mobex to
16	Maritime.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mobex to Maritime?
18	MR. KELLER: February 2006 might
19	have been the closing date, but because
20	there were not two different assignments that
21	I'm aware of.
22	MS. VILLARREAL: That's the action

1	date on the ULS.
2	MR. KELLER: 2007? I'm not aware
3	of anything. I'll have to check that. I'm
4	not aware of anything in 2007.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it's a filing
6	with the Commission.
7	MS. VILLARREAL: It's just the
8	date that they have, as far as when the
9	application was consummated, or the assignment
10	was consummated.
11	MR. KELLER: 2007? I don't
12	MS. KANE: 2007 doesn't sound
13	MR. KELLER: Doesn't sound right.
14	MS. KANE: consistent.
15	MR. KELLER: But at any rate,
16	here's my point: The site-based licenses were
17	acquired by Maritime and the closing date was
18	early the application was in late 2005. It
19	was granted in late 2005. I think the closing
20	date was early 2006. At that point, as a
21	condition to that closing because Mobex was

already in financial difficulty in terms of